arXiv:1606.03325v3 [q-fin.PM] 8 Dec 2016

Model-free portfolio theory and its functional master formula

Alexander Schied* Leo Speiser§ Iryna Voloshchenko**

First version: June 10, 2016
This version: December 8, 2016

Abstract

We use functional pathwise Itô calculus to prove a strictly pathwise version of the master formula in Fernholz' stochastic portfolio theory. Moreover, in our setting, the portfolio-generating function may depend on the entire history of the asset trajectories and on an additional continuous trajectory of bounded variation. Our results are illustrated by several examples and shown to work on empirical market data.

Keywords: Pathwise Itô calculus; Föllmer integral; functional Itô formula; portfolio analysis; market portfolio; portfolio generating functionals; functional master formula on path space; entropy weighting

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is twofold. On the one hand, it deals with an extension of the master formula in stochastic portfolio theory to path-dependent portfolio generating functions. On the other hand, it yields a new case study in which continuous-time trading strategies can be constructed in a probability-free manner by means of pathwise Itô calculus.

Stochastic portfolio theory (SPT) was introduced by Fernholz [8, 9, 10]; see also Karatzas and Fernholz [13] for an overview. Its goal is to construct investment strategies that outperform a certain reference portfolio such as the market portfolio $\mu(t)$; see, e.g., [12, 27, 17]. Here, our focus is mainly on functionally generated portfolios, which in standard SPT are generated from functions $G(t, \mu(t))$ of the current state, $\mu(t)$, of the market portfolio. The performance of the functionally generated portfolio relative to the market portfolio can be described in a very convenient way by the so-called *master formula* of SPT. See Strong [26] for an extension of the master formula to the case in which G may additionally depend on the current state, $A(t)$, of a continuous trajectory A of bounded variation.

In practice, portfolios are often constructed not just from current market prices or capitalizations but also from past data, such as econometric estimates, moving or rolling averages, running maxima,

*Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, aschied@uwaterloo.ca
§Department of Mathematics, University of Mannheim, speiser.leo@gmail.com
**Department of Mathematics, University of Mannheim, ivoloshc@uni-mannheim.de
A.S. and I.V. gratefully acknowledge support by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the Research Training Group RTG 1953.

realized covariance, Bollinger bands, etc. It is therefore a natural question whether it is possible to develop a master formula for portfolios that are generated by functionals of the entire past evolution, $\mu^t := (\mu(s))_{0\leq s\leq t}$, of the market portfolio and maybe also other factors. The first contribution of this paper is an affirmative answer to this question. Our main result, Theorem 2.11, contains a master formula for portfolios that are generated by sufficiently smooth functionals of the form $G(t, \mu^t, A^t)$, where A is an additional m-dimensional continuous trajectory of bounded variation that may depend on μ in an adaptive manner. We then turn to analyzing several concrete examples for portfolios that are generated by functions of mixtures of current asset prices and their moving averages. Our analysis is carried out both on a mathematical level and on empirical market.

The second contribution of this paper concerns the basis for the modeling framework of SPT. While price processes for SPT are usually modeled as Itô processes, it has often been remarked that both sides of the (standard) master formula can be understood in a strictly pathwise manner. So the question arises to what extent a stochastic model is actually needed in setting up SPT. Do price processes really need to be modeled as Itô processes driven by Brownian motion or is it possible to relax this condition and consider more general processes, perhaps even beyond the class of semimartingales? Can one get rid of the nullsets that are inherent in stochastic models, or can one prove the master formula strictly path by path?

Our approach gives affirmative answers also to the questions raised in the preceding paragraph. To this end, we show that SPT can be formulated within the pathwise Itô calculus introduced by Föllmer [14] and further developed to path-dependent functionals by Dupire [7] and Cont and Fournié [2, 3]. Here we will use the slightly extended formalism from [24] and heavily rely on the associativity rule developed there. Thus, the only assumption on the trajectories of the price evolution is that they are continuous and admit quadratic variations and covariations in the sense of [14]. This assumption is satisfied by all typical sample paths of a continuous semimartingale but also by non-semimartingales, such as fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index $H \geq 1/2$ and many deterministic fractal curves [18, 23]. In this sense, our paper is also a contribution to *robust finance*, which aims to reduce the reliance on a probabilistic model and, thus, to model uncertainty; see, e.g., [1, 5, 6, 21, 22] for similar analyses on other financial problems. Robustness results for discrete-time SPT were previously obtained also by Pal and Wong [19], where the relative performance of portfolios with respect to a certain benchmark is analyzed using the discrete-time energy-entropy framework [20, 29, 30].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our market model. Our main result on the pathwise functional extension of the master equation is stated in Theorem 2.11; the corresponding proof is given in Section 5 and relies crucially on the associativity of the pathwise Itô integral in the functional setting, which is derived in [24]. A discussion of examples and simulation results follows Theorem 2.11. Notation and key results of functional pathwise Itô calculus are recalled in Appendix A.

2 Statement of the functional master equation

We work in a strictly pathwise setting, based on the pathwise Itô calculus developed by Föllmer [14], Dupire [7], and Cont and Fournié [2]. In this framework, we derive a functional, path-dependent master formula for Stochastic Portfolio Theory (SPT) [8, 9, 10, 13], and thus can overcome uncertainty issues in specifying a probabilistic model.

In the sequel, we consider a financial market model consisting of d risky assets and a locally

riskless bond. The price of the bond is given by

$$B(t) = \exp\Big(\int_0^t r(s)\ \mathrm{d}s\Big),$$

where $r : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable short rate function satisfying $\int_0^T |r(s)|\,\mathrm{d}s < \infty$ for all $T > 0$. The prices of the risky assets are described by a single d-dimensional continuous path S. We emphasize that no probabilistic assumptions are made on the dynamics of S. All that we require is that the components of S, besides being strictly positive, admit continuous covariations in the pathwise sense proposed by Föllmer [14]. To recall this notion, let $(\mathbb{T}_n)$ be a refining sequence of partitions of $[0,\infty)$, which will remain fixed for the remainder of this paper. That is, $\mathbb{T}_n = \{t_0, t_1, \dots\}$ is such that $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ and $t_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, we have $\mathbb{T}_1 \subset \mathbb{T}_2 \subset \cdots$, and the mesh of $\mathbb{T}_n$ tends to zero on each compact interval as $n \uparrow \infty$. Moreover, it will be convenient to denote the successor of $t \in \mathbb{T}_n$ by t', i.e.,

$$t' = \min\{u \in \mathbb{T}_n \,|\, u > t\}.$$

We then assume that for any $1 \le i, j \le d$ and all $t \ge 0$ the sequence

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{T}_n \\ s \le t}} \big(S_i(s') - S_i(s)\big)\,\big(S_j(s') - S_j(s)\big) \tag{2.1}$$

converges to a finite limit, called the pathwise covariation of S_i and S_j and denoted $[S_i, S_j](t)$, such that $t \to [S_i, S_j](t)$ is continuous. As usual, we write $[S_i] := [S_i, S_i]$ and call this the pathwise quadratic variation of the real-valued path S_i. The class of all continuous functions $S : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the preceding requirement will be denoted by QV^d. As mentioned above, we will require in addition that $S_i(t) > 0$ for all i and t. The corresponding subset of QV^d will be denoted by QV^d_+.

Note that QV^d depends strongly on the choice of the partition sequence $(\mathbb{T}_n)$ and is typically not a vector space [23]. This is significant insofar as polarization of the sums in (2.1) implies that $[S_i, S_j]$ exists if and only if the quadratic variation $[S_i + S_j]$ exists and that

$$[S_i, S_j](t) = \frac{1}{2}\Big([S_i + S_j](t) - [S_i](t) -]S_j](t)\Big). \tag{2.2}$$

Thus, for $d > 1$, the assumption that the covariations $[S_i, S_j]$ exist cannot be reduced to the existence of the quadratic variations $[S_i] = [S_i, S_i]$.

According to [14, 2], the requirement $S \in QV^d$ guarantees that Itô's formula holds in a pathwise—and possibly functional—sense. By taking those functions that appear naturally inside the Itô integral from Itô's formula, we arrive at a natural class of admissible integrands for Itô integrals with integrator S. Here we will use Itô's formula in the form of [24, Theorem 2.1], which slightly extends the one from [2, Theorem 3] and, for the convenience of the reader, is stated in the Appendix. There, we also also recall some basic notions and results from pathwise functional Itô calculus. Note that although we need a functional Itô formula for *continuous* paths X, we still have to consider functionals defined on the space of càdlàg paths, since the definition of functional derivatives requires us to apply discontinuous shocks.

Our notation follows closely the one in [2], with the slight extensions from [24]. For $T > 0$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $D([0,T], V)$ the Skorohod space of right-continuous V-valued functions on $[0,T]$ that admit left-hand limits in V. As usual, $C([0,T], V)$ stands for the continuous V-valued functions. With $BV([0,T], V)$ we denote those functions in $D([0,T], V)$ that are of bounded variation, and with $CBV([0,T], V)$ all continuous functions in $BV([0,T], V)$.

In the sequel, we let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d_+$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d_+ := (0,\infty)^d$ and $W \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$. A function $F : [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W) \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *non-anticipative functional* if $F(t,X,A) = F(t,X^t,A^t)$. Here, for a function Y on $[0,T]$, we denote by $Y^t(s) := Y(s \wedge t)$ the path stopped in $t \in [0,T]$.

Now we define the notion of an admissible integrand ξ for S so as to guarantee the existence of the pathwise Itô integral $\int_0^t \xi(s)\,\mathrm{d}S(s)$ as the limit of non-anticipative Riemann sums in (A.13).

Definition 2.1. A function $\xi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is called an *admissible integrand* for S if for every $T > 0$ there are $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \cdots \tau_N = T$, constants $m_k \in \mathbb{N}$, open sets $W_k \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k}$, functions $A^{(k)} \in CBV([0,\tau_k],W_k)$ and non-anticipative functionals $F_k : [0,\tau_k] \times D([0,\tau_k],U) \times BV([0,\tau_k],W_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem A.4 such that

$$F_k(\tau_k, S, A^{(k)}) = F_{k+1}(\tau_k, S, A^{(k+1)}) \qquad \text{for } k = 1,\dots,N-1$$

and

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \nabla_X F_k(t,S,A^{(k)}) \mathbb{1}_{[\tau_{k-1},\tau_k)}(t).$$

Suppose that ξ is an admissible integrand for S and η is a real-valued measurable function on $[0,\infty)$ such that $\int_0^t |\eta(s)|\,\mathrm{d}|B|(s) < \infty$ for all $t > 0$, where $\mathrm{d}|B|(s)$ denotes integration with respect to the total variation of B. Then the pair (ξ,η) is called a *trading strategy*. As usual, $\xi_i(t)$ corresponds to the number of shares held in the i^{th} stock at time t, and $\eta(t)$ is the number of shares held in the riskless bond at time t.

Definition 2.2. Let ξ be an admissible integrand for S and η a real-valued measurable function on $[0,\infty)$ such that $\int_0^T |\eta(s)|\,\mathrm{d}|B|(s) < \infty$ for all $T > 0$. The trading strategy (ξ,η) is said to be *self-financing* if the associated wealth $V(t) := \xi(t) \cdot S(t) + \eta(t)B(t)$ satisfies the identity

$$V(t) = V(0) + \int_0^t \xi(s)\,\mathrm{d}S(s) + \int_0^t \eta(s)\,\mathrm{d}B(s), \quad t \geq 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that X is a continuous function from $[0,\infty)$ to $\mathbb{R}^d_+$. Then $X \in QV^d_+$ if and only if $\log X := (\log X_1,\dots,\log X_d)^\top \in QV^d$, and in this case,*

$$[\log X_i, \log X_j](t) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{X_i(s)X_j(s)}\,\mathrm{d}[X_i,X_j](s). \tag{2.4}$$

The following two lemmas are standard in stochastic calculus. In our pathwise setting, however, their proofs need the associativity rule from [24], which, for the convenience of the reader, is recalled in Theorem A.5.

Lemma 2.4. *A function $\pi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an admissible integrand for $\log S$ if and only if $\frac{\pi(t)}{S(t)} := \left(\frac{\pi_1(t)}{S_1(t)},\dots,\frac{\pi_d(t)}{S_d(t)}\right)^\top$ is an admissible integrand for S. In this case,*

$$\int_0^t \pi(s)\,\mathrm{d}\log S(s) = \int_0^t \frac{\pi(s)}{S(s)}\,\mathrm{d}S(s) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \frac{\pi_i(s)}{S_i^2(s)}\,\mathrm{d}[S_i](s). \tag{2.5}$$

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that π is an admissible integrand for $\log S$. If we let*

$$V^\pi(t) := \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{\pi(s)}{S(s)}\,\mathrm{d}S(s) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t \frac{\pi_i(s)\pi_j(s)}{S_i(s)S_j(s)}\,\mathrm{d}[S_i,S_j](s) + \int_0^t \Big(1-\sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(s)\Big) r(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right), \tag{2.6}$$

then

$$\xi_i(t) := \frac{\pi_i(t)V^\pi(t)}{S_i(t)}, \quad i=1,\dots,d, \quad \textit{and} \quad \eta(t) := \frac{\big(1-\sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t)\big)V^\pi(t)}{B(t)} \tag{2.7}$$

defines a self-financing strategy with wealth V^π.

Definition 2.6. An $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued measurable function π is called a *portfolio for S* if it is an admissible integrand for $\log S$ and if

$$\pi_1(t) + \cdots + \pi_d(t) = 1, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{2.8}$$

A portfolio for S is called *long-only* if $\pi_i(t) \geq 0$ for all t. The function V^π from (2.6) will be called the *portfolio value* of π with unit initial wealth.

As in [13, Section 2], we normalize the market, i.e., we suppose that at any time t each stock has only one share outstanding. Then, the stock prices $S_i(t)$ represent the capitalizations of the individual companies.

Lemma 2.7. *The quantities*

$$\mu_i(t) := \frac{S_i(t)}{S_1(t)+\cdots+S_d(t)}, \quad i=1,\dots,d,$$

form a portfolio for S, called the market portfolio. *The corresponding portfolio value with unit initial wealth is given by*

$$V^\mu(t) = \frac{S_1(t)+\cdots+S_d(t)}{S_1(0)+\cdots+S_d(0)}.$$

In our model-free version of portfolio theory, we do not wish to make assumptions on the structure of the covariations $[S_i,S_j]$ apart from their existence (2.1). In particular, we do not assume that $[S_i,S_j](t)$ is absolutely continuous in t. Growth rates and covariances, which are functions in [13], therefore need to be modeled as measures.

Definition 2.8. The *covariance* of the stocks in the market is described by the positive semidefinite matrix-valued Radon measure $a = (a_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq d}$ defined as

$$a_{ij}(\mathrm{d}t) := \mathrm{d}[\log S_i, \log S_j](t) = \frac{1}{S_i(t)S_j(t)}\,\mathrm{d}[S_i,S_j](t), \quad i,j=1,\dots,d.$$

The *excess growth rate* of a portfolio π is defined as the signed Radon measure

$$\gamma^*_\pi(\mathrm{d}t) := \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t)a_{ii}(\mathrm{d}t) - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \pi_i(t)\pi_j(t)a_{ij}(\mathrm{d}t)\right).$$

For any portfolio π, we define the *covariances* of the individual stocks *relative to the portfolio* π as follows for $i,j=1,\dots,d$,

$$\tau^\pi_{ij}(\mathrm{d}t) := (\pi(t)-e_i)^\top a(\mathrm{d}t)(\pi(t)-e_j). \tag{2.9}$$

It will follow from Lemma 4.3 below that $\tau^\pi = \left(\tau_{ij}^\pi\right)$ is always a positive semidefinite matrix-valued Radon measure. Moreover, if π is long-only, Lemma 4.4 states that the excess growth rate γ_π^* is a positive Radon measure.

We can now introduce the notion of *portfolio generating functionals*. These are smooth functionals that may depend on the entire past evolution of the trajectories $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_d$. We use the concepts and notation of functional pathwise Itô calculus from [7, 2] in the version of [24]; see also the Appendix. Denote by Δ^d the standard simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and introduce the notation $\Delta_+^d := \{(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_d)^\top \in \Delta^d \mid \pi_1 > 0 \ldots \pi_d > 0\}$.

Lemma 2.9. *We suppose that $V \supset \Delta_+^d$ and $W \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ are open sets and $G : [0,T] \times D([0,T], V) \times BV([0,T], W) \to (0,\infty)$ is a non-anticipative functional satisfying the conditions of Theorem A.4. Then, for every $A \in CBV([0,T], W)$,*

$$\pi_i(t) = \mu_i(t) + \mu_i(t)\partial_i \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) - \sum_{j=1}^d \mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)\partial_j \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t), \quad 1 \le i \le d, \tag{2.10}$$

is a portfolio for S and called the portfolio generated by G. *Moreover, π is an admissible integrand for $\log \mu$, where $\log \mu(t) := (\log \mu_1(t), \ldots, \log \mu_d(t))$ is defined in analogy to $\log S$.*

Definition 2.10. Suppose that G is as in Lemma 2.9. Then the portfolio π with weights (2.10) is called the *portfolio generated by G*.

The following theorem is the main result of this paper. It extends the "master equation" from Fernholz [9] to our present setting.

Theorem 2.11 (**Functional Master equation**). *For G as in Lemma 2.9, the relative wealth of the portfolio π generated by G with respect to the market portfolio is given by the following* functional master equation

$$\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(T)}{V^\mu(T)}\right) = \log\left(\frac{G(T, \mu^T, A^T)}{G(0, \mu^0, A^0)}\right) + \mathfrak{g}([0,T]) + \mathfrak{h}([0,T]), \quad 0 \le T < \infty, \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathrm{d}t) := -\frac{1}{2G(t, \mu^t, A^t)} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{ij} G(t, \mu^t, A^t)\mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)\tau_{ij}^\mu(\mathrm{d}t)$$

is the second-order drift term, and

$$\mathfrak{h}(\mathrm{d}t) := -\sum_{k=0}^d \mathcal{D}_k \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t)\, \mathrm{d}A_k(t) = -\sum_{k=0}^d \frac{1}{G(t, \mu^t, A^t)} \mathcal{D}_k G(t, \mu^t, A^t)\, \mathrm{d}A_k(t),$$

where $A_0(t) := t$.

3 Examples

Next we discuss simulation results in order to get some basic idea about the behavior of portfolio generating functionals and their associated portfolios. In the following examples, we will work with

convex combinations $\widetilde{\mu}(t) := \alpha\mu(t) + (1-\alpha)\overline{\mu}(t)$, where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\overline{\mu}$ is the (modified) moving average defined by

$$\overline{\mu}_i(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_0^t \mu_i(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{\delta}\int_{-\delta}^0 \mu_i(0)\,\mathrm{d}s, & t \in [0,\delta), \\ \frac{1}{\delta}\int_{t-\delta}^t \mu_i(s)\,\mathrm{d}s, & t \in [\delta, T], \end{cases} \qquad i = 1,\dots,d,$$

for $\delta > 0$. Then, for certain smooth functions g on $\mathbb{R}^d_+$, we will consider generating functionals of the form $G(t,\mu^t,\overline{\mu}^t) = g(\alpha\mu(t) + (1-\alpha)\overline{\mu}(t)) = g(\widetilde{\mu}(t))$, where $\overline{\mu}(t)$ plays the role of the finite-variation component $A(t)$ in Theorem 2.11.

Example 3.1 (Geometric mean). Consider the functional $G(t,\mu^t,\overline{\mu}^t) := \prod_{k=1}^d (\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^{\frac{1}{d}}$, which generates the portfolio with weights

$$\pi_i(t) = \left[\frac{\alpha}{d\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)} + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\alpha\mu_j(t)}{d\widetilde{\mu}_j(t)}\right]\mu_i(t). \tag{3.1}$$

The master equation (2.11) implies that the relative performance of this portfolio with respect to the market is given by

$$\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(T)}{V^\mu(T)}\right) = \log\left(\frac{\prod_{k=1}^d (\widetilde{\mu}_i(T))^{\frac{1}{d}}}{\prod_{k=1}^d (\mu_k(0))^{\frac{1}{d}}}\right) + \int_0^T \mathfrak{g}(\,\mathrm{d}t) + \int_0^T \mathfrak{h}(\,\mathrm{d}t),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{g}(\,\mathrm{d}t) = \frac{\alpha^2}{2d}\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\mu_i^2(t)}{(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t))^2}\tau_{ii}^\mu(\mathrm{d}t) - \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)}{\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)\widetilde{\mu}_j(t)}\tau_{ij}^\mu(\mathrm{d}t)\right)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{h}(\,\mathrm{d}t) = -\frac{1-\alpha}{d\delta}\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)} \cdot \begin{cases} \mu_i(t) - \mu_i(0), & 0 \le t < \delta, \\ \mu_i(t) - \mu_i(t-\delta), & 0 < \delta \le t. \end{cases}$$

The following two figures display the results of a simulation of such a geometrically weighted portfolio with the parameters $\delta = 60$ days and $\alpha = 0,7$. We used the stock data base from Reuters Datastream; we considered 30 (fixed) stocks that were the constituents of the DAX in May 2015. Our 30 time series represent daily closing prices for the period January 31, 2005 – May 15, 2015.

In Figure 1 we see the relative performance of the portfolio (3.1) with respect to this stock index. In Figure 2 we see the decomposition of the curve(s) in the left-hand panel according to the master equation. The blue curve is the change in the generating functional, while the red and the green ones are the respective drift terms. Each curve shows the cumulative value of the daily changes induced in the corresponding quantities by capital gains and losses. As can be seen, the cumulative second-order drift term was the dominant part over the period, with a total contribution of about 15 percentage points to the relative return. The second-order drift term was quite stable over the considered period, with an exception of the period around the financial crisis of 2008.



Figure 1: LHS vs. RHS of the master formula (2.11) for geometric weighting



Figure 2: Componentwise representation of the RHS of (2.11) for geometric weighting

Example 3.2 (**Functional diversity-weighting**). Consider the functional

$$G(t,\mu^t,\overline{\mu}^t) := \left(\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p\in(0,1),$$

which generates the portfolio with weights

$$\pi_i(t) = \left[\frac{\alpha\,(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t))^{p-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^p} + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{d}\frac{\alpha\mu_j(t)\,(\widetilde{\mu}_j(t))^{p-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^p}\right]\mu_i(t). \tag{3.2}$$

The relative performance of this portfolio with respect to the market is given by

$$\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(T)}{V^\mu(T)}\right) = \log\left(\frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(T))^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\mu_k(0))^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}}\right) + \int_0^T \mathfrak{g}(\,\mathrm{d}t) + \int_0^T \mathfrak{h}(\,\mathrm{d}t),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{g}(\,\mathrm{d}t) = \frac{\alpha^2(1-p)}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{\mu_i^2(t)\,(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t))^{p-2}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^p}\tau_{ii}^{\mu}(\,\mathrm{d}t) - \sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\frac{\mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)\,(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t))^{p-1}\,(\widetilde{\mu}_j(t))^{p-1}}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^p\right)^2}\tau_{ij}^{\mu}(\,\mathrm{d}t)\right)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{h}(\,\mathrm{d}t) = -\frac{1-\alpha}{\delta}\sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t))^{p-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t))^p}\,\mathrm{d}t\cdot\begin{cases}\mu_i(t)-\mu_i(0), & 0\le t<\delta,\\ \mu_i(t)-\mu_i(t-\delta), & 0<\delta\le t.\end{cases}$$

To simulate such a diversity weighted portfolio with actual stocks, we used again Reuters Datastream to obtain our data base; we considered 207 (fixed) stocks that were part of the constituents of the S&P 500 index in May 2015. Our 207 time series represent monthly average prices for the period February 2, 1973 – April 2, 2015.

The results of a simulation of the portfolio (3.2) using the parameters $\delta = 12$ months, $\alpha = 0,6$, and $p = 0,1$ are presented below: Figure 3 shows the relative performance of this portfolio with respect to this filtered index, and Figure 4 shows its decomposition in the three components according to the master equation. Each curve represents the cumulative value of the monthly changes induced in the corresponding quantities by capital gains and losses, but in contrast to Example 3.1, it is now the cumulative change in the generating functional that yields the dominant part over the period, with a total contribution of about 70 percentage points to the relative return. The second-order drift term was quite stable over the period with a total contribution of about 30 percentage points, whereas the horizontal drift term has a negative contribution.



Figure 3: LHS vs. RHS of the master formula (2.11) for diversity weighting



Figure 4: Componentwise representation of the RHS of (2.11) for diversity weighting

Example 3.3 (**Functional entropy-weighting).** Consider the functional

$$G(t, \mu^t, \overline{\mu}^t) := -\sum_{k=1}^{d} \widetilde{\mu}_k(t) \log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t)\right),$$

which generates the portfolio with weights

$$\pi_i(t) = \left[\frac{\alpha \log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} \widetilde{\mu}_k(t) \log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t)\right)} + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{\alpha \mu_j(t) \log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_j(t)\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{d} \widetilde{\mu}_k(t) \log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k(t)\right)}\right] \mu_i(t), \tag{3.3}$$

and associated drift rates

$$\mathfrak{g}(\,\mathrm{d}t) = \frac{\alpha^2}{2G(t,\mu^t)} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{\mu_i^2(t)}{\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)} \tau_{ii}^{\mu}(\mathrm{d}t)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{h}(\,\mathrm{d}t) = \frac{1-\alpha}{\delta G(t,\mu^t)} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(\log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)\right) + 1\right) \,\mathrm{d}t \cdot \begin{cases} \mu_i(t) - \mu_i(0), & 0 \le t < \delta, \\ \mu_i(t) - \mu_i(t-\delta), & 0 < \delta \le t. \end{cases}$$

Using the same data set as in Example 3.2, we ran a simulation of the portfolio (3.3) with respect to the filtered index taking the parameters $\delta = 6$ months and $\alpha = 0,9$, which is presented in Figure 5 and Figure 6, respectively.

Setting

$$\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu(\,\mathrm{d}t) := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{\mu_i^2(t)}{\widetilde{\mu}_i(t)}\tau^\mu_{ii}(\mathrm{d}t), \tag{3.4}$$

the master equation (2.11) reads for the portfolio (3.3):

$$\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(T)}{V^\mu(T)}\right) = \log\left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^d \widetilde{\mu}_k(T)\log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k(T)\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^d \mu_k(0)\log\left(\mu_k(0)\right)}\right) + \int_0^T \frac{\alpha^2\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu(\,\mathrm{d}t)}{G(\widetilde{\mu}(t))} + \mathfrak{h}([0,T]) \tag{3.5}$$

$$\geq \log\left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^d \widetilde{\mu}_k(T)\log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k(T)\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^d \mu_k(0)\log\left(\mu_k(0)\right)}\right) + \mathfrak{h}([0,T]) + \frac{\alpha^2\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu([0,T])}{\log d}. \tag{3.6}$$

Note that the positive Radon measure $\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu$ from (3.4) describes the market's "intrinsic" volatility, in some extended sense, since it is a weighted average of the variances of the individual stocks relative to the market. If we now assume that $\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu$ is a strictly positive measure, (3.6) yields $V^\pi(T) > V^\mu(T)$, under the additional condition that the horizontal drift term is significantly outperformed, i.e.,

$$\log\left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^d \widetilde{\mu}_k(T)\log\left(\widetilde{\mu}_k(T)\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^d \mu_k(0)\log\left(\mu_k(0)\right)}\right) + \frac{\alpha^2\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu([0,T])}{\log d} + \mathfrak{h}([0,T]) > 0. \tag{3.7}$$

In this sense, "availability of intrinsic volatility" can be regarded as a property that admits strong relative arbitrage with respect to the market, provided that the horizontal drift term satisfies (3.7). Moreover, note that compared to the entropy-weighted portfolio in the classical Fernholz' setting the additional drift term $\mathfrak{h}([0,T])$ appears in (3.7), which can be either positive or negative. In this sense, the horizontal drift term $\mathfrak{h}([0,T])$ may be regarded as quantifying thetrade-off between outperforming the market and more generality.

The above argument is supported by real market data, as can be seen in Figure 5 and Figure 6: Indeed, since the cumulative second-order drift term is continually increasing, we infer that the (extended) excess growth rate of the market $\widetilde{\gamma}^*_\mu$ is a strictly positive measure. Moreover, the horizontal drift term does not seem to have a large influence on the relative performance of the entropy-weighted portfolio, with a total contribution of less than 1 percentage point. Thus, entropy-weighting should significantly outperform the market on the considered time interval, which is confirmed in the case study of Figure 5.



Figure 5: LHS vs. RHS of the master formula (2.11) for entropy weighting



Figure 6: Componentwise representation of the RHS of (2.11) for entropy weighting

4 Pathwise portfolio dynamics

In this section, we analyze the dynamics of portfolios and portfolio values. In standard stochastic portfolio theory, many of these results are well known (see, e.g., [13]), but occasionally additional care is needed in our pathwise setting. The results in this section will serve as preparation for the proof of the functional master formula, but they are also of independent interest.

Throughout this section, π will be a portfolio for $S \in QV_+^d$ and V^π the corresponding portfolio value with unit initial wealth as given in (2.6). Due to the condition that $\pi^1(t) + \cdots + \pi^d(t) = 1$, formula (2.6) simplifies to

$$V^\pi(t) = \exp\left(\int_0^t \frac{\pi(s)}{S(s)} \, \mathrm{d}S(s) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t \frac{\pi_i(s)\pi_j(s)}{S_i(s)S_j(s)} \, \mathrm{d}[S_i, S_j](s) \right). \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.1. *We have* $\mathrm{d} \log V^\pi(t) = \pi(t) \, \mathrm{d} \log S(t) + \gamma_\pi^*(\mathrm{d}t)$.

Proof. Föllmer's pathwise Itô formula [14], applied to $f(x) = \log x$ and the paths S_i individually, yields

$$\mathrm{d} \log S_i(t) = \frac{1}{S_i(t)} \, \mathrm{d}S_i(t) - \frac{1}{2(S_i(t))^2} \, \mathrm{d}[S_i](t).$$

Thus, using Lemma 2.3, the associativity of the Stieltjes integral from [28, Theorem I.6 b], and Theorem A.5, we get

$$\mathrm{d} \log V^\pi(t) = \pi(t) \, \mathrm{d} \log S(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t) \, \mathrm{d}[\log S_i](t) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \pi_i(t)\pi_j(t) \, \mathrm{d}[\log S_i, \log S_j](t),$$

which implies the assertion via the definition of γ_π^*. □

Applying the preceding lemma to the market portfolio yields the following results.

Lemma 4.2. *We have the following formulas for the dynamics of the market weights* μ_i.

(a) $\mathrm{d} \log \mu_i(t) = \big(e_i - \mu(t)\big) \, \mathrm{d} \log S(t) - \gamma_\mu^*(\mathrm{d}t)$.

(b) $\tau_{ij}^\mu([0,t]) = [\log \mu_i, \log \mu_j](t)$ *and* $\mathrm{d}[\mu_i, \mu_j](t) = \mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)\tau_{ij}^\mu(\, \mathrm{d}t)$.

(c) $\mathrm{d}\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(t)\big(e_i - \mu(t)\big) \, \mathrm{d} \log S(t) - \mu_i(t)\gamma_\mu^*(\, \mathrm{d}t) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_i(t)\tau_{ii}^\mu(\, \mathrm{d}t)$.

Proof. (a) The definition of μ_i and the formula for V^μ from Lemma 2.7 yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mu_i(t) &= \log S_i(t) - \log(S_1(t) + \cdots + S_d(t)) \\ &= \log S_i(t) - \log V^\mu(t) - \log(S_1(0) + \cdots + S_d(0)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Taking differentials and using Lemma 4.1 proves the claim.

(b) First, it follows, e.g., from (4.2) that $\log \mu \in QV^d$. Next, since $t \mapsto \gamma^*_\mu([0,t])$ is continuous and of bounded variation, it has vanishing quadratic variation. Hence, (a) and [22, Remark 8 and Proposition 12] imply that

$$\begin{aligned}[\log \mu_i](t) &= \Big[\int_0^\cdot \big(e_i - \mu(s)\big) \,\mathrm{d} \log S(s) \Big](t) \\ &= \sum_{k,l=1}^d \int_0^t \big((e_i)_k - \mu_k(s)\big)\big((e_i)_l - \mu_l(s)\big) \,\mathrm{d}[\log S_k, \log S_l](t) \\ &= \int_0^t \big(\mu(t) - e_i\big)^\top a(\,\mathrm{d}t)\big(\mu(t) - e_i\big) = \tau^\mu_{ii}([0,t]).\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

The polarization identity (2.2) now yields the first claim in (b). The second one then follows with Lemma 2.3.

(c) Setting

$$I(t) := \int_0^t \big(e_i - \mu(s)\big) \,\mathrm{d} \log S(s)$$

and integrating (a) gives $\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(0) \exp\big(I(t) - \gamma^*_\mu([0,t])\big)$. Using that $t \mapsto \gamma^*_\mu([0,t])$ is of bounded variation and hence has vanishing quadratic variation, the pathwise Itô formula gives

$$\mu_i(t) = \mu_i(0) + \int_0^t \mu_i(s) \,\mathrm{d}I(s) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \mu_i(s) \,\mathrm{d}[I](s) - \int_0^t \mu_i(s) \gamma^*_\mu(\,\mathrm{d}s).$$

To deal with the first integral on the right-hand side, the associativity rule of Theorem A.5 yields that $\int_0^t \mu_i(s) \,\mathrm{d}I(s) = \int_0^t \mu_i(s)\big(e_i - \mu(s)\big) \,\mathrm{d} \log S(s)$. For the second integral, (4.3) and the associativity of the Stieltjes integral [28, Theorem I.6 b] imply that $\int_0^t \mu_i(s) \,\mathrm{d}[I](s) = \int_0^t \mu_i(s) \tau^\mu_{ii}(\,\mathrm{d}s)$. This yields (c). □

The proofs of the following lemmas are left to the reader, since they follow straightforwardly by adapting the respective proofs from [13, Section 3] to our functional pathwise setting. For every stock i and every portfolio π, we denote by

$$R^\pi_i(t) := \log\left(\frac{S_i(t)}{V^\pi(t)}\right), \quad 0 \le t < \infty,$$

the relative return of the i-th stock with respect to the portfolio π.

Lemma 4.3. *For every portfolio π, for all $1 \le i, j \le d$, we have $\tau^\pi_{ij}([0,t]) = [R^\pi_i, R^\pi_j]$. In particular, $\tau^\pi_{ii}(\mathrm{d}t) = \mathrm{d}[R^\pi_i](t) \ge 0$, and $\tau^\pi = (\tau^\pi_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le d}$ is a positive semidefinite matrix-valued Radon measure.*

Lemma 4.4. *For any pair of portfolios π and ρ we have the following* numéraire invariance property

$$\gamma^*_\pi(\mathrm{d}t) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t) \tau^\rho_{ii}(\mathrm{d}t) - \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \pi_i(t)\pi_j(t) \tau^\rho_{ij}(\mathrm{d}t)\right).$$

In particular, the excess growth rate of a portfolio π can be represented as a weighted average of the variances τ^π_{ii} of the individual stocks relative to the portfolio π, i.e.,

$$\gamma^*_\pi(\mathrm{d}t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t) \tau^\pi_{ii}(\mathrm{d}t).$$

Furthermore, for any long-only portfolio π we get

$$\gamma_\pi^*(\mathrm{d}t) \geq 0.$$

The following lemma is valid if π is a portfolio for S that is also an admissible integrand for $\log \mu$. Lemma 2.4 (applied with $\log \mu$ in place of $\log S$) states that the latter requirement is equivalent to $\frac{\pi}{\mu}$ being an admissible integrand for μ. By Lemma 2.9, this requirement is satisfied for the functionally generated portfolio from (2.10).

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that π is a portfolio for S that is also an admissible integrand for $\log \mu$. Then*

$$\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(t)}{V^\mu(t)}\right) = \int_0^t \frac{\pi(s)}{\mu(s)} \mathrm{d}\mu(s) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t \pi_i(s)\pi_j(s)\tau_{ij}^\mu(\mathrm{d}s). \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. First, as noted above, $\frac{\pi}{\mu}$ is an admissible integrand for μ. Using Lemma 4.2 and the associativity of the Stieltjes integral from [28, Theorem I.6 b] together with the associativity of the pathwise functional Itô integral, Theorem A.5, yields that

$$\frac{\pi(t)}{\mu(t)}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(t) = \big(\pi(t) - \mu(t)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\log S(t) - \gamma_\mu^*(\,\mathrm{d}t) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t)\tau_{ii}^\mu(\,\mathrm{d}t),$$

due to the fact that the portfolio weights sum up to one. Furthermore, applying the numéraire invariance property from Lemma 4.4 gives us

$$\frac{\pi(t)}{\mu(t)}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(t) = \big(\pi(t) - \mu(t)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\log S(t) - \gamma_\mu^*(\,\mathrm{d}t) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^d \pi_i(t)\pi_j(t)\tau_{ij}^\mu(\mathrm{d}t)\right) + \gamma_\pi^*(\,\mathrm{d}t).$$

On the other hand, Lemma 4.1 yields that

$$\mathrm{d}\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(t)}{V^\mu(t)}\right) = (\pi(t) - \mu(t))\,\mathrm{d}\log S(t) + (\gamma_\pi^* - \gamma_\mu^*)(\mathrm{d}t).$$

Subtracting these formulas from each other now yields the assertion. □

As a preparation for the proof of Theorem 2.11, the following lemma further calculates the right-hand side of (4.4) in case π is the functionally generated portfolio from (2.10).

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be as in Lemma 2.4, π be the portfolio generated by G, and let us write*

$$g(t) = (g_1(t), \ldots, g_d(t))^\top := \nabla_\mu \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t). \tag{4.5}$$

Then

$$\log\left(\frac{V^\pi(t)}{V^\mu(t)}\right) = \int_0^t g(s)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(s) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t \mu_i(s)\mu_j(s)g_i(s)g_j(s)\,\tau_{ij}^\mu(\,\mathrm{d}s).$$

Proof. First, we deal with the Itô integral in (4.4). With the shorthand notation (4.5), the definition (2.10) of π becomes $\pi_i = \mu_i(t)(g_i(t) + 1 - \mu(t)^\top g(t))$, and so $\frac{\pi(t)}{\mu(t)} = g(t) + (1 - \mu(t)^\top g(t))\mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1} := (1, \ldots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the vector whose entries are all 1. Since both $\frac{\pi}{\mu}$ and g are admissible integrands for μ, the function $\frac{\pi}{\mu} - g = (1 - \mu^\top g)\mathbf{1}$ must also be an admissible integrand for μ. But

$\mathbf{1}^\top(\mu(t)-\mu(s))=0$ for all s and t, and therefore the Riemann sums in the approximation (A.13) of the pathwise Itô integral $\int_0^t(1-\mu(s)^\top g(s))\mathbf{1}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(s)$ must all vanish. It follows that this Itô integral is zero, and hence that $\int_0^t \frac{\pi(s)}{\mu(s)}\mathrm{d}\mu(s)=\int_0^t g(s)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(s)$.

To deal with the rightmost integral in (4.4), we first note that

$$\tau_{ij}^{\mu}(\mathrm{d}t)=a_{ij}(\mathrm{d}t)-\sum_{\ell=1}^{d}\mu_\ell(t)a_{i\ell}(\mathrm{d}t)-\sum_{k=1}^{d}\mu_k(t)a_{kj}(\mathrm{d}t)+\sum_{k,\ell=1}^{d}\mu_k(t)\mu_\ell(t)a_{k\ell}(\mathrm{d}t).$$

Thus, using the fact that the components of μ sum up to 1 we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d}\mu_j(t)\tau_{ij}^{\mu}(\mathrm{d}t)=0,\quad i=1,\dots,d. \tag{4.6}$$

Using that $\pi_i=\mu_i(t)(g_i(t)+1-\mu(t)^\top g(t))$, the preceding identity yields that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\pi_i(t)\pi_j(t)\tau_{ij}^{\mu}(\,\mathrm{d}t)=\sum_{i,j=1}^{d}g_i(t)g_j(t)\mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)\tau_{ij}^{\mu}(\,\mathrm{d}t).$$

This proves the lemma. □

5 Proofs of the results from Section 2

Proof of Lemma 2.3. (a) First, we suppose that $S\in QV_+^d$ and let $Z:[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}_+$ be any continuous path. It follows from [25, Proposition 2.2.10] that $Z\in QV_+^1$ if and only $\log Z\in QV^1$ and that, in this case,

$$[\log Z](t)=\int_0^t\frac{1}{Z(s)^2}\,\mathrm{d}[Z](s). \tag{5.1}$$

By (2.2), we may conclude that $\log S\in QV^d$, if we can show that $f(S_i(t),S_j(t))$ belongs to QV^1 for all i,j, where $f(x_1,x_2):=\log x_1+\log x_2$. The pathwise Itô formula from [14] applied to $f(S_i(t),S_j(t))$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}f(S_i(t),S_j(t))&=f(S_i(0),S_j(0))+\int_0^t\nabla f(S_i(s),S_j(s))\,\mathrm{d}\begin{pmatrix}S_i(s)\\S_j(s)\end{pmatrix}\\&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k,\ell=1}^{2}\int_0^t f_{x_k,x_\ell}(S_i(s),S_j(s))\,\mathrm{d}[S_k,S_\ell](s),\end{aligned}$$

where f_{x_k,x_ℓ} denotes the second partial derivative of f w.r.t. x_k and x_ℓ. Remark 8 and Proposition 12 from [22] now imply that $f(S_i,S_j)\in QV^1$ with quadratic variation

$$\begin{aligned}[f(S_i,S_j)](t)&=\sum_{k,\ell=1}^{2}\int_0^t f_{x_k}(S_i(s),S_j(s))f_{x_\ell}(S_i(s),S_j(s))\,\mathrm{d}[S_k,S_\ell](s)\\&=\int_0^t\frac{1}{S_i(s)^2}\,\mathrm{d}[S_i](s)+\int_0^t\frac{1}{S_j(s)^2}\,\mathrm{d}[S_j](s)+2\int_0^t\frac{1}{S_i(s)S_j(s)}\,\mathrm{d}[S_i,S_j](s).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (2.4) now follows from (2.2) and (5.1). That $\log S\in QV^d$ implies $S\in QV_+^d$ follows by an analogous argument in which the logarithm is replaced by the exponential function. □

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Let $X := \log S$ and write $\exp(X)$ for the path with components $e^{X_1}, \dots, e^{X_d}$. That is, $\exp(X) = S$. Let $F(t, X^t, A^t)$ be a functional satisfying the assumptions of Theorem A.4 and define $G(t, S^t, A^t) := F(t, \log S^t, A^t)$. It follows from the chain rules in [24, Lemma 3.2] that the horizontal derivative of $G(t, S^t, A^t)$ equals the horizontal derivative of $F(t, X^t, A^t)$ at $X = \log S$ and that the vertical derivatives exist and are related as follows,

$$\partial_i G(t, S^t, A^t) = \frac{\partial_i F(t, X^t, A^t)}{S_i(t)}\Big|_{X=\log S},$$
$$\partial_j \partial_i G(t, S^t, A^t) = \frac{\partial_j \partial_i F(t, X^t, A^t) - \delta_{ij} \partial_i F(t, X^t, A^t)}{S_j(t) S_i(t)}\Big|_{X=\log S}.$$

Since the paths $S_i(t)$ are bounded away from zero on any compact interval, it is clear that all these derivatives satisfy the assumptions of Theorem A.4. This proves that $\frac{\pi}{S}$ is an admissible integrand for S if π is an admissible integrand for $\log S$. The converse implication follows in the same manner by reversing the roles of X and S and replacing log with exp. To prove the formula (2.5), use the pathwise Itô formula, which yields

$$\mathrm{d} \log S_i(t) = \frac{1}{S_i(t)} \, \mathrm{d}S_i(t) - \frac{1}{2S_i(t)^2} \, \mathrm{d}[S_i](t).$$

Thus, the associativity rule (Theorem A.5 or, in this special case, [22, Theorem 13]) implies (2.5). □

Proof of Lemma 2.5. It is clear from Lemma 2.4 that the Itô integral in (2.6) is well defined. Moreover, the two rightmost integrals in (2.6) exist as Stieltjes integrals, because $\pi(t)/S(t)$ as admissible integrand for S is in particular a continuous function of t. Therefore, V^π is well defined and indeed the wealth of (ξ, η) since $V^\pi(t) = \xi(t) \cdot S(t) + \eta(t) B(t)$. It follows moreover from [24, Theorem 4.1] that $V^\pi(t) \frac{\pi(t)}{S(t)} = \xi(t)$ is an admissible integrand for S and that V^π is the unique solution of the pathwise Itô differential equation

$$\mathrm{d}V(t) = V(t) \, \frac{\pi(t)}{S(t)} \, \mathrm{d}S(t) + V(t) \, \frac{\big(1 - \sum_{i=1}^d \pi_i(t)\big)}{B(t)} \, \mathrm{d}B(t),$$

with initial condition $V(0) = 1$. The preceding equation clearly implies that (ξ, η) is self-financing. □

Proof of Lemma 2.7. For $X \in D([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \log(e^{x_1} + \cdots + e^{x_d})$ let $F(t, X) := f(X(t))$. Then F is clearly a nonanticipative functional satisfying the assumptions of Theorem A.4. Its i^{th} partial vertical derivative is given by

$$\partial_i F(t, X) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(t, X(t)) = \frac{e^{X_i(t)}}{e^{X_1(t)} + \cdots + e^{X_d(t)}},$$

and so $\partial_i F(t, \log S) = \mu_i(t)$. The fact that $\mu_1(t) + \cdots + \mu_d(t) = 1$ is obvious. Therefore, μ is a portfolio in the sense of Definition 2.6.

To prove the formula for V^μ, let $g(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \log(x_1 + \cdots + x_d)$ for $x_i > 0$. The pathwise Itô formula from [14] yields

$$g(S(t)) - g(S(0)) = \int_0^t \frac{\mu_i(s)}{S_i(s)} \, \mathrm{d}S(s) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t \frac{\mu_i(s) \mu_j(s)}{S_i(s) S_j(s)} \, \mathrm{d}[S_i, S_j](s).$$

By (4.1), the right-hand side is equal to $\log V^\mu(t) - \log V^\mu(0)$, which proves our claim. □

Proof of Lemma 2.9. We first show that π is an admissible integrand for $\log S$ and, hence, a portfolio for S. For $X \in D([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define $f(X) \in D([0,T],\Delta_+^d)$ as the path with components

$$(f(X))_i(t) := \frac{e^{X_i(t)}}{e^{X_1(t)} + \cdots + e^{X_d(t)}}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, d.$$

Then we define the non-anticipative functional

$$F(t, X^t, A^t) := \log G(t, f(X)^t, A^t).$$

By the chain rules in [24, Lemma 3.2], F inherits the smoothness properties from G, and its i^{th} partial vertical derivative is

$$\partial_i F(t, X^t, A^t) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} (\partial_j \log G)(t, f(X)^t, A^t) \partial_i (f(X)^t)_j(t).$$

Here, $\partial_i (f(X)^t)_j(t)$ denotes the i^{th} partial vertical derivative at time t of the non-anticipative functional $(t, X) \mapsto (f(X))_j(t)$. It is given by

$$\partial_i (f(X)^t)_j(t) = \frac{e^{X_i(t)}}{e^{X_1(t)} + \cdots + e^{X_d(t)}} \, \delta_{ij} - \frac{e^{X_i(t)} e^{X_j(t)}}{(e^{X_1(t)} + \cdots + e^{X_d(t)})^2}.$$

Thus, we get that for $X := \log S$,

$$\partial_i F(t, X^t, A^t) = \mu_i(t) \partial_i \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mu_i(t) \mu_j(t) \partial_j \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) =: \widetilde{\pi}(t). \tag{5.2}$$

It follows that $\widetilde{\pi}$ is an admissible integrand for $\log S$. With Lemma 2.7 we get moreover that $\pi := \mu + \widetilde{\pi}$ is an admissible integrand for $\log S$. The fact that $\pi_1(t) + \cdots + \pi_d(t) = 1$ is again obvious.

Now we prove that π is an admissible integrand for $\log \mu$. To this end, let f and F be as above and observe that $f(\log S) = f(\log \mu) = \mu$. Therefore, the identity (5.2) also holds for $X := \log \mu$, and it follows that $\widetilde{\pi}$ is an admissible integrand also for $\log \mu$. Hence, it only remains to prove that μ is an admissible integrand for $\log \mu$. To this end, let $\Phi(t, X) := e^{X_1(t)} + \cdots + e^{X_d(t)}$ for $X \in D([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$. Clearly, Φ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem A.4 and $\partial_i \Phi(t, X) = e^{X_i(t)}$. Thus, for $X = \log \mu$, we have $\partial_i \Phi(t, \log \mu) = \mu_i(t)$ and the claim follows. □

After all these preparations, we can now prove the pathwise functional master formula of Theorem 2.11.

Proof of Theorem 2.11. As in the proof of Lemma 4.6, we will use the shorthand notation $g_i(t) := \partial_i \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t)$ and $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_d)^\top$. Then the change of variables formula, Theorem A.4, implies

$$\mathrm{d} \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) = g(t) \mathrm{d}\mu(t) + \sum_{k=0}^{d} \mathcal{D}_k \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) \, \mathrm{d}A_k(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \partial_{ij}^2 \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) \, \mathrm{d}[\mu]_{ij}(t),$$

where again $A_0(t) = t$. The chain rule for vertical derivatives (see, e.g., [24, Lemma 3.2]) yields

$$\partial_{ij}^2 \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) = \frac{\partial_{ij}^2 G(t, \mu^t, A^t)}{G(t, \mu^t, A^t)} - \partial_i \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t) \, \partial_j \log G(t, \mu^t, A^t).$$

This fact and Lemma 4.2 (b) now yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\log G(t,\mu^t,A^t) &= g(t)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(t) + \sum_{k=0}^{d} \mathcal{D}_k \log G(t,\mu^t,A^t)\,\mathrm{d}A_k(t)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\left(\frac{\partial_{ij}^2 G(t,\mu^t,A^t)}{G(t,\mu^t,A^t)} - g_i(t)g_j(t)\right)\mu_i(t)\mu_j(t)\tau_{ij}^{\mu}(\mathrm{d}t).\end{aligned}$$

Comparing this formula with Lemma 4.6, we see that

$$\mathrm{d}\log\left(\frac{V^{\pi}(t)}{V^{\mu}(t)}\right) = \mathrm{d}\log G(t,\mu^t,A^t) + \mathfrak{g}(\mathrm{d}t) + \mathfrak{h}(\mathrm{d}t).$$

Integrating both sides of this identity and using the fact that $V^{\pi}(0) = 1 = V^{\mu}(0)$ now gives the assertion. □

A Appendix: Functional pathwise Itô calculus

In the following, we give a short overview on the definitions, notations, and main results of pathwise functional Itô calculus. In particular, we state a functional Itô formula and an associativity rule for Itô integrals in the form derived in [24]. Our framework is based on [2, 3, 7], our notation is close to the one in [2].

Let us fix $T > 0$, $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and open sets $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $W \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Informally, the set U will be used as range of d-dimensional paths of quadratic variation, whereas W will stand for the range of an additional m-dimensional path of bounded variation. For $X, \widetilde{X} \in D([0,T],U)$ and $A, \widetilde{A} \in D([0,T],W)$, we denote

$$d_{\infty}\big((X,A),(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{A})\big) = \sup_{u\in[0,T]}|X(u)-\widetilde{X}(u)| + \sup_{u\in[0,T]}|A(u)-\widetilde{A}(u)|. \tag{A.1}$$

For any path $Y : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in [0,T]$, we denote by Y^t the path stopped in t. That is, $Y^t(s) = Y(s \wedge t)$. As mentioned before, $F : [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W)$ is called a *non-anticipative functional* if $F(t,X,A) = F(t,X^t,A^t)$. It is called *left-continuous* if for all $(t,X,A) \in [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{A})$ we have the following implication

$$d_{\infty}\big((X,A),(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{A})\big) + h < \eta \quad\Longrightarrow\quad |F(t,X,A) - F(t-h,\widetilde{X},\widetilde{A})| < \epsilon. \tag{A.2}$$

The non-anticipative functional F is called *boundedness-preserving* if for all compact set $K \subset U$ and $L \subset W$ there exists a constant $C_{K,L}$ such that

$$|F(t,X,A)| \le C_{K,L} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T],\ X \in D([0,T],K), \text{ and } A \in BV([0,T],L). \tag{A.3}$$

Definition A.1 (**Horizontal derivative**)**.** Let F be a non-anticipative functional and $(t,X,A) \in (0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W)$ and suppose that the following limits exist:

$$\mathcal{D}_0 F(t,X,A) := \lim_{h\downarrow 0}\frac{F(t,X^{t-h},A^{t-h}) - F((t-h),X^{t-h},A^{t-h})}{h} \tag{A.4}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_k F(t,X,A) := \lim_{h\downarrow 0}\frac{F(t,X^{t-h},A_1^{t-h},\dots,A_k^{t},\dots,A_m^{t-h}) - F(t,X^{t-h},A^{t-h})}{A_k(t) - A_k(t-h)}, \tag{A.5}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, m$, where we use the convention $\frac{0}{0} = 0$. Then, the *horizontal derivative* of F at (t, X, A) is given by the vector

$$\mathcal{D}F(t, X, A) = (\mathcal{D}_0 F(t, X, A), \dots, \mathcal{D}_m F(t, X, A))^\top .$$

If (A.4) and (A.5) are well-defined for all (X, A), then F is called *horizontally differentiable*, and the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}F : [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \\ (t, X, A) &\longmapsto \mathcal{D}F(t, X, A) \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

defines a non-anticipative vector-valued functional called the *horizontal derivative* of F, where we use the convention $\mathcal{D}F(0, X, A) := 0$.

Note that the definition of the horizontal derivatives is based on left-hand limits, and thus only the past evolution of the underlying path is relevant while no assumptions on the possible future values are imposed (this is inspired by [4, Definition 2.9]).

For $X \in D([0,T],U)$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the vertical perturbation $X^{t,h}$ of the stopped path X^t is defined as the càdlàg path obtained by shifting the value at t by the quantity h, that is,

$$X^{t,h}(u) = X^t(u) + h\mathbb{1}_{[t,T]}(u).$$

Clearly, $X^{t,h}$ belongs again to $D([0,T],U)$ if $|h|$ is sufficiently small.

Definition A.2 (**Vertical derivative**)**.** A non-anticipative functional F is said to be *vertically differentiable* at $(t, X, A) \in [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W)$ if the map $\mathbb{R}^d \ni v \to F(t, X^{t,v}, A)$ is differentiable at $v = 0$. In this case, the i^{th} partial vertical derivative of F at (t, X, A) is defined as

$$\partial_i F(t, X, A) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(t, X^{t,he_i}, A) - F(t, X, A)}{h},$$

where e_i is the i^{th} unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The corresponding gradient is denoted by

$$\nabla_X F(t, X, A) = (\partial_1 F(t, X, A), \dots, \partial_d F(t, X, A)) . \tag{A.7}$$

is called the *vertical derivative* of F at (t, X, A). If F is vertically differentiable at every triple (t, X, A), then F is called *vertically differentiable* and the map

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_X F : [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \\ (t, X, A) &\longmapsto \nabla_X F(t, X, A) \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

defines a non-anticipative functional $\nabla_X F$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ called the *vertical derivative of* F.

If the functional F admits horizontal and vertical derivatives $\mathcal{D}F$ and $\nabla_X F$, we can iterate the operations of taking horizontal and vertical derivatives so as to to define higher-order horizontal and vertical derivatives. In particular, we define

$$\partial_{ij} F := \partial_i(\partial_j F).$$

Definition A.3. We denote by $\mathbb{C}^{j,k}[0,T]$ the set of all non-anticipative functionals F such that the following conditions are satisfied.

(a) F is *continuous at fixed times t, locally uniformly in t*. That is, for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $(t, X, A) \in [0,T] \times D([0,T],U) \times BV([0,T],W)$ there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $(t', \widetilde{X}, \widetilde{A})$,

$$d_\infty\big((X,A),(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{A})\big) + |t - t'| < \eta \Rightarrow |F(t',X,A) - F(t',\widetilde{X},\widetilde{A})| < \epsilon. \tag{A.9}$$

(b) F is j-times horizontally and k-times vertically differentiable.

(c) F and all its horizontal and vertical derivatives are left-continuous in the sense of (A.2) and boundedness-preserving in the sense of (A.3).

The following result is a slight extension of the functional change of variables formula from [2, 7] in the form of [24, Theorem 2.1]. As in Section 2, we let $(\mathbb{T}_n)$ be a fixed refining sequence of partitions of $[0,T]$ and define the corresponding set QV^d and the covariations $[X_i, X_j]$ for $X \in QV^d$. If X is a path in $D([0,T],U)$ and $t \in (0,T]$, we denote by X^{t-} the path in $D([0,T],U)$ defined through $X^{t-}(s) := \lim_{r \uparrow t} X^r(s) = \lim_{r \uparrow t} X(r \wedge s)$. For $t = 0$, we set $X^{0-}(s) := X(0)$. Also, we denote by $v \cdot w$ the Euclidean inner product of $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem A.4. (Pathwise functional Itô formula [7, 2, 24]) *Let $X \in QV^d \cap C([0,T],U)$, $A \in CBV([0,T],W)$, and define*

$$X^n(t) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_n} X(s') \mathbb{1}_{[s,s')}(t) + X(T) I_{\{T\}}(t), \tag{A.10}$$

$$A^n(t) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_n} A(s) \mathbb{1}_{[s,s')}(t) + A(T) I_{\{T\}}(t), \tag{A.11}$$

$$h^n_s := s' - s \qquad \text{for } s, s' \in \mathbb{T}_n. \tag{A.12}$$

Then for $F \in \mathbb{C}^{1,2}[0,T]$ the pathwise Itô integral

$$\int_0^T \nabla_X F(s,X,A)\,\mathrm{d}X(s) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_n} \nabla_X F(s,(X^n)^{s-},(A^n)^s) \cdot (X(s') - X(s)) \tag{A.13}$$

exists and, for $A_0(t) := t$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(T,X,A) - F(0,X,A) = {} & \int_0^T \nabla_X F(s,X,A)\,\mathrm{d}X(s) + \sum_{k=0}^m \int_0^T \mathcal{D}_k F(s,X,A)\,\mathrm{d}A_k(s) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^T \partial^2_{ij} F(s,X,A)\,\mathrm{d}[X_i,X_j](s). \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

The preceding Itô formula gives rise to a natural notion of admissible integrands for a path $X \in QV^d \cap C([0,T],U)$ as those functions ξ that are of the form $\xi(t) = \nabla_X F(t,X,A)$ for some $F \in \mathbb{C}^{1,2}[0,T]$. By localizing this notion, we arrive at Definition 2.1, which is the basis for the following associativity rule.

Theorem A.5. (Associativity rule [24, Theorem 3.1]) *Let $X \in QV^d \cap C([0,T],U)$ and $\xi_{(1)}, \ldots, \xi_{(k)}$ be admissible integrands for X. If we define*

$$Y_\ell(t) := \int_0^t \xi_{(\ell)}(s)\,\mathrm{d}X(s), \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, k, \tag{A.15}$$

then $Y := (Y_1, \dots, Y_k)^\top \in QV^k$. *Moreover, if* $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots \eta_k)$ *is an admissible integrand for* Y, *then* $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \eta_\ell \xi_{(\ell)}$ *is an admissible integrand for* X *and*

$$\int_0^T \eta(s)\,\mathrm{d}Y(s) = \int_0^T \sum_{\ell=1}^k \eta_\ell(s)\xi_{(\ell)}(s)\,\mathrm{d}X(s). \tag{A.16}$$

References

[1] Bick, A. and Willinger, W. (1994): Dynamic spanning without probabilities. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 50(2):349-374.

[2] Cont, R. and Fournié, D. A. (2010): Change of variable formulas for non-anticipative functionals on path space. *Journal of Functional Analysis 259 1043-1072.*

[3] Cont, R. and Fournié, D. A. (2013): Functional Itô Calculus and Stochastic Integral Representation of Martingales. *The Annals of Probability Vol. 41, No. 1, 109-133.*

[4] Cosso, A. and Russo, F. (2014): A regularization approach to functional Itô calculus and strong-viscosity solutions for path-dependent PDEs. *arXiv: 1401.5034.*

[5] Cox, A. M. G. and Oblój, J. (2011): Robust hedging of double touch barrier options. *SIAM J.Financial Math., 2:141-182.*

[6] Davis, M., Oblój, J. and Raval, V. (2014). Arbitrage bounds for prices of weighted variance swaps. *Math. Finance, 24(4):821 – 854.*

[7] Dupire, B. (2009): Functional Itô calculus. *Portfolio Research Paper 2009-04, Bloomberg.*

[8] Fernholz, E. R. (1999): On the diversity of equity markets. *Journal of Mathematical Economics 31, 393-417.*

[9] Fernholz, E. R. (1999a): Portfolio generating functions. In M. Avellaneda (ed.), *Quantitative Analysis in Financial Markets, River Edge, NJ. World Scientific.*

[10] Fernholz, E. R. (2002): Stochastic Portfolio Theory. *Springer-Verlag, New York.*

[11] Fernholz, E. R. and Karatzas, I. (2005): Relative arbitrage in volatility-stabilized markets. *Annals of Finance 1, 149-177.*

[12] Fernholz, E. R., Karatzas, I. and Kardaras, C. (2005): Diversity and arbitrage in equity markets. *Finance & Stochastics 9, 1-27.*

[13] Fernholz, E. R. and Karatzas, I. (2009): Stochastic Portfolio Theory: an Overview, Handbook of numerical analysis 15, pages 89-167.

[14] Föllmer, H. (1979/80): Calcul d' Itô sans probabilités. *Seminar on Probability XV (Univ. Strasbourg, Strasbourg, 1979/1980) (French), volume 850 of Lecture Notes in Math., pages 143-150. Springer, Berlin, 1981.*

[15] Föllmer, H. (2001): Probabilistic aspects of financial risk. *In European Congress of Mathematics, Vol. I (Barcelona, 2000), volume 201 of Progr. Math., pages 21-36. Birkhäuser, Basel.*

[16] Karatzas, I. and Kardaras, C. (2007): The numéraire portfolio and arbitrage in semimartingale markets. *Finance & Stochastics 11, 447-493.*

[17] Karatzas, I. and Ruf, J. (2016): Trading strategies generated by Lyapunov functions, *http://www.oxford-man.ox.ac.uk/∼jruf/papers/Lyapunov.pdf.*

[18] MishuraY. and SchiedA. (2016): Constructing functions with prescribed pathwise quadratic variation, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 442, 117-137.*

[19] Pal, S. and Wong, T. L. (2016): Energy, entropy, and arbitrage. *Arxiv preprint: arXiv:1308.5376v2 1 Jan 2016.*

[20] Pal, S. and Wong, T. L.: The geometry of relative arbitrage. *Mathematics and Financial Economics (forthcoming).*

[21] Schied, A. and Stadje, M. (2007): Robustness of delta hedging for path-dependent options in local volatility models. *J. Appl. Probab., 44(4):865-879.*

[22] Schied, A. (2014): Model-free CPPI. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control 40, 84-94.*

[23] Schied, A. (2016): On a class of generalized Takagi functions with a linear pathwise quadratic variation, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 433, 947-990.*

[24] Schied, A. and Voloshchenko, I. (2016): The associativity rule in pathwise functional Itô calculus, *ArXiv: 1605.08861.*

[25] Sondermann, D. (2006): *Introduction to stochastic calculus for finance. A new didactic approach.* In: Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, vol. 579. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[26] Strong, W. (2014): Generalizations of functionally generated portfolios with applications to statistical arbitrage, *SIAM J. Financial Math. Vol. 5, pp. 472-492.*

[27] Vervuurt, A. and Karatzas, I. (2015): Diversity-weighted portfolios with negative parameter, *Annals of Finance, 11(3-4):411-432.*

[28] Widder, D., V. (1941): The Laplace Transform. *Princeton Mathematical Series, v. 6. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.*

[29] Wong, T. L. (2015): Optimization of relative arbitrage. *Annals of Finance 11, no. 3, 345-382.*

[30] Wong, T. L. (2015): Universal portfolios in stochastic portfolio theory. *ArXiv e-prints.*